

## REMARKS

Claims 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Ishida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,341). Applicants traverse the rejection because the cited reference does not disclose the transfer clock pattern of the present invention.

Ishida has servo information and a clock that are simultaneously formed by magnetic transfer. Hence, the servo information is synchronized with the clock at the time of the magnetic transfer. However, according to the present invention, only a transfer clock pattern having low density is formed by magnetic transfer. Then, after the magnetic recording medium is loaded into a drive, a clock pattern is formed by increasing the density by multiplying the frequency. Thus, the clock pattern itself is made after the magnetic transfer. Accordingly, the clock of Ishida is different from the transfer clock pattern of the present invention. For this reason, withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claim 5 and dependent claims 6-8 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 9-10 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of Yatsu (U.S. Publication No. 2004/005935 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because the cited reference does not disclose (or suggest), among other things, a magnetic recording and reproducing apparatus or method that records preformat information excluding the servo information of the magnetic recording medium by the recording head.

Yatsu positions a head 12 based on servo information (i.e., a servo pattern). The servo information is written onto a disk 10 by write head device 12 W of a servo writing

apparatus 2. Yatsu does not disclose the recording of preformat information other than the servo information on the magnetic recording medium by the recording head, as recited in claims 1 and 9. For this reason, withdrawal of the §103 rejection of independent claims 1 and 9, independent claims 10 and 15 is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of Yatsu (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,215). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because there is no motivation to combine the references.

The Examiner identifies the feature of “fining a pattern of the reproduced preformat information” as corresponding to Ishida’s disclosure, wherein a pattern of a master stamper is formed by utilizing a variety of fine processing techniques so as to make a fine information signal. However, although the present application discloses to fine reproduce information, the present invention could not further fine a signal which is recorded by using the master stamper of Ishida. That is, the present invention is adopted when fine processing cannot be performed. If fine processing is available, then the present invention is not necessary. For this reason, withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claim 2 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishida in view of Yatsu. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the reasons recited above with respect to the rejection independent claim 5. That is, the clock of Ishida and the transfer clock pattern of the present invention are different.

In addition to the above, it is impossible to achieve the present invention by modifying Ishida by using the recording head of Yatsu. The present invention synchronizes the clock pattern by using PLL, and records the clock pattern on a magnetic recording medium. Since the combination of Ishida and Yatsu cannot achieve this feature, withdrawal of the §103 rejection of claims 3-4 is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-14 and 16-19 stand rejected based on combinations of Ishida, Yatsu, Yamakoshi (U.S. Patent No. 6,381,292) and Tanaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,680,267). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.


Since claims 11-14 and 16-19 ultimately depend upon independent claim 9, they necessarily include all of the features of their associated independent claim plus other additional features. Thus, Applicants submit that the §103 rejection of 11-14 and 16-19 has also been overcome for the same reasons mentioned above to overcome the rejection of independent claim 9. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of these claims also be withdrawn.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

February 1, 2005  
300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 360-0080  
Customer No. 24978

By:   
Joseph P. Fox  
Registration No. 41,760